

From: [McKenna, James \(Jim\)](#)
To: [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [TARNOW.Karen@deq.state.or.us](#)
Cc: [Valerie Oster](#); [ANDERSON Jim M](#); [JOHNSON Keith](#); [Kristine Koch/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)
Subject: Stormwater list
Date: 12/15/2006 03:53 PM

Eric and Karen,

It has come to my attention that a significantly modified list of sites was circulated late Wednesday afternoon for the tech team to review. I am quite concerned on two fronts: a) procedurally how this revised list was generated, and b) this may impede the tech team's chances of coming to consensus Monday morning. I am not being a stickler here and I am not trying to throw a wrench in the works. Rather, we all recognized the importance of controlling this collaborative process in order to optimize the chances of achieving a consensus approach. This is critical when considering the tight time constraint we are under. Here are my concerns and recommendations for moving forward:

a) Procedural. The revised list was generated by Dawn and Tom Roick last week. I'm not sure how Tom got involved with the tech group, especially when we tried to keep enrollment to a minimum. If his input was deemed necessary, we should have formally appointed him to the tech group and cc'd him on all communications. The revised list was not circulated to the broader tech group until late Wednesday, so the assertions made by some at Wednesday's Management Team meeting that the tech group was in agreement with the list were false. In fact, the tech team, prior to Wednesday's Management Team meeting, was asked to focus on the sampling methodologies and not on the list. Therefore, it is troubling that a small sub-group of the tech team was given the opportunity to modify Eric's list without accommodating input from other members. This is especially troubling in that the revisions are not presented in "red-line", making it quite difficult to determine what has been changed, deleted, or added. (For example, the headers and columns are significantly different, there are many changes to the "comments" in the far right column, the outfalls at the BP terminal and Schnitzer riverside sites have been dropped). In order to adequately manage this process, I recommend we stick with the established tech group attendees and make sure all are cc'd on emails. In addition, circulated comments should be presented in red-line format.

b) Monday Tech Meeting. I recommend the tech team stick to reviewing Eric's list. This will help avoid the confusion of having to compare Eric's list with the newly revised list. Those parties that provided suggested changes to Eric's list last week can restate their suggestions Monday for the entire group to vet.

Thanks,

Jim McKenna
Port of Portland
Phone (503) 944-7325
Fax (503) 944-7353